DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 253 378 RC 015 153

AUTHOR Landon, Craig Louis
TITLE The Johnson O'Malley Program in the Public Schools of Washington State: Recent Directions in Indian Curricular Practice.
INSTITUTION Washington Office of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Olympia.
PUB DATE 83
NOTE 56p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Advisory Committees; *American Indian Education; American Indians; Cooperative Planning; Educational Objectives; *Educational Planning; Elementary Secondary Education; Federal Programs; Improvement Programs; *Parent School Relationship; *Participative Decision Making; Policy Formation; Public Schools
IDENTIFIERS *Johnson O Malley Act; *Parent Advisory Committees; Washington

ABSTRACT

Utilizing data from 31 applications for financial assistance from Johnson-O'Malley (JOM) Indian Education Fund for the 1980-81 school year, the study examined the influence of Indian Parent Advisory Committees (PACs) over school curricula and activities supported by JOM funds in Washington State. Applications were surveyed for information relating to Indian community goals, broad educational goals, and specific program activities intended to meet or support the goals. Priority Weighted Valuations (PWVs), developed by taking the product of reported priority of a goal or activity multiplied by the frequency of its appearance in the applications, were summed for each goal or activity to provide ordinal measures of its "importance." PAC expressions of curricular concerns and actual school program attempts to meet those concerns were compared. Findings indicated that: PACs expressed 17 broad educational goals, while program activities fell into 15 categories of services; improved academic achievement, the major concern of both parents and schools, appeared well-matched by school activity; counseling services, the second highest ranked activity, addressed several goals, yet was valued much lower by parents when improved counseling services were considered as a goal; and the matches and mismatches suggested a lack of coherence in planning JOM projects in numerous districts and programs. (NQA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED257718

THE JOHNSON-O'MALLEY PROGRAM IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF WASHINGTON STATE: RECENT DIRECTIONS IN INDIAN CURRICULAR PRACTICE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

F B. Brouillet

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

RC015153

The Johnson-O'Malley Program in the Public Schools of Washington State:

Recent Directions in Indian Curricular Practice

Dr. Frank B. Brouillet
Superintendent of Public Instruction
State of Washington

Mrs. Mona H. Bailey
Assistant Superintendent
Division of Instructional Programs & Services

Warren H. Burton, Director
Office for Multicultural and Equity Education

Dr. Willard E. Bill
Supervisor of Indian Education

Developed and written by
Craig Louis Landon
1983

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction.	1
Chapter I: Structure of the Study.	7
Procedure.	7
Method	8
Chapter II: Findings and Discussion.	11
Description of the Findings.	11
Discussion of Community Goals.	14
Discussion of Broad Educational Goals.	15
Discussion of Project Activities	19
Chapter III: Considerations and Recommendations.	21
Considerations Arising from the Study.	21
Recommendations.	24
List of References.	27
Appendix A: State Form E-376	28
Appendix B: Tables	33
Executive Summary of the Study.	45

LIST OF TABLES

Page

Table B.1.a.: Community Goals 34

Table B.1.b.: Broad Educational Goals 36

Table B.1.c.: Project Activities 39

Table B.2.: Priority Weighted Valuation Statewide Totals 42

B.2.a.: Community Goals 42

B.2.b.: Broad Educational Goals 42

B.2.c.: Project Activities 43

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to express his deepest appreciation to Dr. Willard Bill, State Supervisor of Indian Education, for his assistance in the preparation of this manuscript and for his fine example in many years as the Director of the Indian Teacher Education Project at the University of Washington. In addition, sincere thanks to his secretary, Donna Page and the other members of the staff of the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction for their assistance in locating the materials needed in the author's work. Thanks also to Dr. James Vasquez for his advice on the conduct of this work.

INTRODUCTION

In November of 1969, a report from a Senate sub-committee chaired by Senator Edward M. Kennedy declared that

> "Every effort should be made to encourage Indian Parents and tribal leaders to assume increasing responsibility for the education of Indian children in accordance with the concept of community action"[1].

This conclusion of the "Kennedy Report" was reached after the most thorough review of the effects of Federal Indian education policy since the famed "Meriam Report" of the Brookings Institution in 1928. Just as that earlier report detailed the failures of fifty years of a Federal education policy which attempted to force Indians to assimilate into the dominant Euro-American culture, so the Kennedy Report revealed the failures of the reform policy which Congress had adopted under urging from John Collier, whom Franklin Roosevelt had appointed Commissioner of Indian Affairs in 1933. While the adoption of the Johnson-O'Malley Act of 1934 had reduced the role of the Bureau of Indian Affairs area offices and school system in favor of contracted assistance to states which wished to assume more complete responsibility for the education of Indian children within their borders, the basic assumptions of what Indians needed from their education remained largely assimilationist.[2]

J.A. Jones has written that the conclusions reached in the Kennedy Report mark the birth of the concept of Indian education per se, and that Indian people can be expected to pursue social and economic advancement if allowed to do so on their own terms. "What those terms are is one of the great debates that is being waged between Indians now."[3] The spark for that debate was a law enacted by Congress in 1975 as a result of the findings of the Kennedy Report. Public Law 93-638, the Indian Self-determination and Educational Assistance Act of 1975, revolutionized the practice of Indian education by requiring the participation of Indian parent groups, chosen by and from among the parents themselves, in the plannning, design, implementation and evaluation of any educational program funded by Congress with the intent of benefitting Indian students. These Parent Advisory Committees (PACs) were given both the power of final approval over the expenditures of such funds and the option to contract directly with the Federal agency (usually the Bureau of indian Affairs) responsible for administration of the appropriation involved for the direct operation of educational programs under tribal authority.

Among the Federal educational programs affected by the requirements of P.L. 93-638 is the Johnson-O'Malley program. Altered in purpose somewhat since the 1930s by Congressional amendment and the passage of other Indian education aid statutes, JOM presently serves to provide funds to school districts on or adjacent to Indian reservations, or to tribal governments directly, for the purpose of "supplementing federal assistance for education of Indian children in public schools."[4] It is intended to allow such schools to meet extraordinary needs associated with Native children and not provided for by other sources. Additionally, the students served must be at least one-fourth Indian blood and be otherwise eligible for BIA services; as a result, the JOM program does not serve Indians living in major urban areas, since few of these are on or next to a reservation.

The State of Washington was the second state to have contracted with the BIA for use of Johnson-O'Malley funds; the relationship began in 1936 and saw a number of problems over the use to which the State put the money and over shifting Federal policies with regard to Indians and their education.[5] In the early 1970s, the BIA began experimenting with grants directly to tribal governments for the operation of education projects.[6] Since then, and

especiallly since 1975, decisions about what objects for which JOM funds should be expended have come increasingly under the control of Indian parents, with a concommitant decline in the influence of the BIA and the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction over the content of the curricula and other activities being supported by JOM funding. As a result, there has been a shift in authority over the definition of what the "extraordinary needs" of Indian students in the public schools of Washington State are. This can be seen in a statement contained in a needs assessment study published by the Center for the Study of Migrant and Indian Education in 1971, where professionals and "spokesmen of the minority community" are seen as setting educational goals, but where parents are not mentioned.[7] Today, such an omission would be unthinkable, as reflected in a policy statement issued by the Superintendent of Public Instruction following the passage of P.L. 93-638.[8]

It is the purpose of this study to examine the nature of the unique educational needs of Indian children as determined by the parents of the children, in the context of the new relationship between parents and schools created by the revised regulations for the operation of Johnson-O'Malley programs in Washington State. It should

be borne in mind that such an examination will not provide complete and definitive answers to the question, as the JOM program is only one of several which attempt to address the needs of Indian children in this State, and since shifting federal policies with regard to Indian education still produce an unstable educational environment, one which results in annual redefinition of needs as resources ebb and flow and PACs attempt to stay within limits of fiscal feasibility. A further limit to the universality of the findings of this study lies in the fact that the JOM programs do not cover the needs of Indian students in several major urban areas of the State; additionally, the diversity in situations among the tribal groups which are involved makes each a fairly unique phenomenon, thus reducing the generalization which might allow a scholar to make predictive statements about other Indian groups not a part of this present study.

---

[1]Subcommittee on Indian Education, Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Final Report. 91st Congress, 1st Session. November, 1969. p. 583.

[2]Szasz, Margaret C. Education and the American Indian. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press. 1977. p. 188-9.

[3]Jones, J.A. "Landmarks on the Path of Indian Education". Thresholds in Education. May, 1978, IV. p. 15.

[4]1980-81 Annual Report, Washington State Johnson-O'Malley Educational Programs for Indian Children. Olympia: Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction. p. 2.

[5]Szasz, op.cit., p. 97-98.

[6]1980-81 Annual Report, op.cit.. p. 3.

[7]Krebs, Robert E. and Stevens, Gail A. An Assessment of Needs Related to the Education of Indian Children in the State of Washington. Toppenish- Center for the Study of Migrant and Indian Education, 1971. p. 4.

[8]Brouillet, Frank B. "A Declaration of Indian Education Policy by the State Superintendent of Public Instruction". October 7, 1975. p. 1-2.

CHAPTER I: STRUCTURE OF THE STUDY

PROCEDURE

The present study includes information from thirty-one school districts and Indian-controlled educational programs operated in conjunction with school districts; these are located throughout the State of Washington. Most are in rural areas, although a few are operated in medium-sized urban areas, by Washington standards. The smallest program consists of twenty Indian students, while the largest includes 467. The smallest school program is one operated by an Indian tribe, serving ninety-eight students, sixty of whom are non-Indian. The largest school district involved in the study enrolled 12,044 students during the year for which data are presented here (1980-81); however, this district enrolled only sixty-seven Indian students in that year. The total number of students enrolled in schools served by these Johnson-O'Malley programs was 60,484 and the number of Indian students totalled 3,264. The proportion of Indian students enrolled ranged from 0.5% to 99% of the total in particular districts, with a mean proportion for the thirty-one programs of 5.3%. There were five programs for which complete data on students was not available from the records; these lacunae are reflected in the figures presented above.

METHOD

The information used in this study came from individual program applications submitted to the State Supervisor of Indian Education on Washington State Form E-376. A copy of this form is provided in Appendix A. In making application for Johnson-O'Malley funds, a program submits several kinds of required information in order to justify the amount of assistance requested from the State, which administers the Johnson-O'Malley funds under contract with the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The exception to this rule is the program which will be operated by an Indian tribe directly, in which case the application is made between the tribe and the BIA on a rather different set of forms, which supply most of the same information required on the E-376. Five programs involved here used this direct procedure; as a result, information about Community Goals is not completely available for these five programs.

There are three kinds of information of interest to this study to be obtained from these forms. Statements of Indian Community Goals by the parents of Indian students is one type, and has been mentioned already. The other two are statements of Broad Educational Goals and of Project Activities, which are developed jointly by the

Indian Parent Advisory Committee (PAC) and the school district in which the project is to be carried out. In two cases involved in the study, these latter groups are identical or nearly so; however, they will be treated along with the other projects in identical manner.

The author spent considerable time precisely abstracting the information contained in the three kinds of statements and then analysing the statements to produce a set of categories into which each element of each kind of statement could be placed. Once this qualitative and therefore subjective categorization was made, it was possible to make use of the fact that Form E-376 requires a prioritization of the Community and Broad Educational Goals and the Project Activities to construct, first, nominal relationships among the Goals or Activities, and second, by applying a weighting factor proportional to the priority of each itemm, a set of ordinal relationships. These latter, in the form of a number which the author calls a "Priority Weighted Valuation", allow for judgements to be drawn as to the comparative importance of each kind of Goal and Activity, in the opinion of the Indian parents of students enrolled in these JOM programs throughout the State. Thus, for the first time (to the author's knowledge), it will be possible to discuss

quantitatively the significance of the unique educational needs of Indian students in the public schools of Washington State to the curricula being presented through the JOM programs.

CHAPTER II: FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

DESCRIPTION OF THE FINDINGS

The findings of the investigation into Community Goals, Broad Educational Goals and Project Activities will be presented separately, with salient information about the Priority Weighted Valuation of each item in the three major divisions then brought together in order that some conclusions may be reached about the needs of Indian pupils as seen by their parents, and about the coherence of the projects being designed under the auspices of JOM to provide curricula that address those needs.

Before proceeding, the derivation of the values for the Priority Weighted Valuations will be discussed in greater detail than that presented in Chapter I. The items in each of the three major divisions of Community Goals, Broad Educational Goals and Project Activities had been prioritized by the JOM PACs and school personnel. To derive the PWVs, the author totalled the number of items in each category of Goal or Activity and multiplied the total by a weighting factor corresponding to the priority level assigned by the parents. Priority 1 (the highest) had a multiplier of five, while priority 2 had a multiplier of four, and so on down to the lowest priority level found among the data, which was priority 5, with a multiplier of one. The resultant PWVs were then summed

horizontally according to identical categories to derive the values of the Priority Weighted Valuation Statewide Totals, as the most meaningful measure the author could devise for the expression of the curricular beliefs of Indian people for the education of their children in the JOM programs. It should be borne in mind that the Priority Weighted Valuations are ordinal figures; due to the nature of the process used by the parent groups for the prioritization of the educational needs of their children, it is not possible to say that a PWV of 80 indicates a need that is twice as important as a PWV of 40. It can be said, however, that the higher valuation indicates either a higher level of priority, or a higher frequency of occurrence, or both, of a given category of need.

Before commencing the discussion of the findings in particular, the author believes that a few general points should be laid before the reader in order to aid interpretation of the material. The author served as the Coordinator of the Johnson-O'Malley program in one of the school districts (during the year) involved in this study. The experience gained thereby, and in the course of discussions with collegues in other JOM programs, will be reflected in certain comments about the procedures and

influences which operate in parent group determinations of the needs that are reported in this study. Another consideration involves the author's selection of data for this study. Due to a combination of circumstances at the Indian Education desk at the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction (recently changed quarters, a new State Supervisor of Indian Education, and a temporary replacement secretary), only two years' worth of files on JOM programs were available for the greater portion of the time available to the author for data collection. Of these, the 1980-81 data were chosen as the basis for study for two reasons: these were the more recent materials, and they mark a sort of high-water point in the development of JOM since the effective requirement for parent participation was mandated. This is due to two further factors. First, funding for Indian programs in general has suffered from recent national economic policies; JOM in Washington State has seen a decline in funding annually from $1,217,840 in 1976 to $350,942 in 1980-81, and to $264,335 in 1981-82.[1] This decline has influenced the scope of the educational needs which JOM can feasibly attempt to meet, and PACs must reckon with this reduction in scope in their planning. Second, the level of expertise of Indian parents in dealing with the

translation of Indian values into a form acceptable to an institutional system of education which remains largely alien increases annually as school JOM personnel, administrators and the parents acquire a clearer vision of what is allowable under the program regulations and as experience shows which activities best serve to meet the needs which have been identified. It is a sad paradox that the first factor has tended to counteract the second.

DISCUSSION OF COMMUNITY GOALS

Examination of the data presented in Table B.1.a. and Table B.2.a. (Appendix B) reveals that the Indian parent committees, which had sole responsibility for the preparation of the Community Goals statements (school personnel were involved in the process of preparing the Broad Educational Goals and Project Activities statements, along with the parents) believe that their communities are in need of three main and three secondary types of developments. Improvements in the quality and relevance of school education to the social needs of Indian communities, greater economic and employment opportunities for members of the tribes, and improved relationships between the tribal governments/tribal members and the schools and non-Indians are separated by a range of PWVs

of only 10. This small range suggests the possibility that these three issues are closely related; indeed, each seems to refer to an important element in what a tribal person might be experiencing as day-to-day social relations within the context of a life dominated economically and politically by a culture not one's own. In such a context, these kinds of issues would appear to be paramount, as they affect most daily activities, aspirations and strategies for survival.

The remaining three concens appear to be focused on intratribal matters; these are the desire for improved tribal government, a concern for the preservation of the unique features of Indian culture and values and for the participation of Indian youth in the socialization into the culture and values of the tribe, and for improvements in the personal image held by Indian people, which has sometimes suffered in comparison to Indian perceptions (and misperceptions) of white society.

DISCUSSION OF BROAD EDUCATIONAL GOALS

There is a caveat which must be kept in mind by the reader when examining the data on Broad Educational Goals and the related Project Activities (this latter to be discussed in the final section of this chapter). The

prioritization and, indeed, the very selection and wording of the items in the categories reported in these sections are influenced to an indeterminate degree by the participation of school district personnel in the process of developing the statements reported in these sections of Form E-376 (see Appendix A). The author is aware of cases among the programs reported in this study where this influence has been very great. There exist notes in the file maintained at the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction for one of these programs which indicate that the district Superintendent lacked a clear and cooperative understanding of the function of the parent Advisory Committee in determining goals and activities for the JOM project in the district. Further, there is evidence in the wording of statements for the Broad Educational Goals and the Project Activities sections of the E-376 forms for two sets of districts and programs which indicates that "boilerplate" suggestions, probably from the BIA or from JOM training workshops, made up the bulk of the needs considered for inclusion in the projects involved. One set of these involved two adjacent districts, while the other involved three tribally-contracted programs in the school districts with which the tribes had relations. In both cases, there was

little if any variation in wording or content of the statements, with the only variations being in the order of prioritization. This sort of influence makes a key assumption of this study less secure than the author would prefer: if Indian parents are being heavily influenced, the effects of their participation in the education of their children may not produce much deviation from conventional curricular practices, which have been declared disastrous.[2]

Tables B.1.b. and B.2.b. make a powerful statement of belief in the need to improve the academic achievement of Indian students in what are called the "basic skills" of education: reading, mathematics, writing and speaking. As a Priority 1 item, this concern appeared three times more frequently than did the next highest concern, that of improved retention of students in school (drop-out prevention), advancement in grade level, and high school completion. Overall, parent/school concern for academic success of Indian students was followed by expression of a desire for increased Indian student participation in extracurricular activities. The rationale for this category seemed to be that such activities offered Indians opportunities to be appreciated for their physical talents, for cooperative and positive social interaction

with non-Indians, and for learning the skills involved in teamwork. Such objectives appear to emphasize affective and psychomotor outcomes (to use Benjamin Bloom's expressions), while the academic concrns relate more to cognitive outcomes. A good many of the remaining categories of Broad Educational Goals in Table B.2.b. appear directed to affective outcomes, especially those which refer to increased Indian parent involvement in the functions of the Parent Advisory Committees and in school activities. The underlying assumption in these Goals seems to be that "being there" and "involved" will result in parents who are happier with the educational process and thus, be more likely to encourage a positive attitude toward school on the part of Indian students. This assumes that Indian children will be more active and successful in participating in the curriculum and extracurriculum of the public schools if they "feel good" about their experiences within the institution. This is an operative assumption of the dominant white, middle-class culture; whether it holds true for Indians and other minorities is a matter which must be tested in studies other than this one.

DISCUSSION OF PROJECT ACTIVITIES

Two types of concrete activities dominate the work of JOM projects in the public schools of Washington State; these are "basic skills" improvement tutorials and the provision of enhanced counseling services. The PWV range between them is only a single point, and the valuation appears to be about twice (in frequency x priority measure) that of the next pair, which is the provision of Indian cultural activities/coursework in the school program, and the provision of home-school liason services. These two are also close in overall valuation, with a PWV range of only five points between them. The function of the home-school liason is to provide information to parents about the progress being made by students in various school activities and about the existence and nature of school programs and services. Thus, it is akin to counseling services provided to students in the school. It is apparent here that the major activities carried out by JOM programs have a cognitive and affective outcomes intention similar to that found in the major Broad Educational Goals; this impression is further reinforced if the reader examines the minor activities which immediately follow the four major activities (see Table B.2.c.). These are strongly affective in nature, and

include efforts to improve parent involvement and student incentives to participate in various aspects of the school program. An assumption identical to that discussed in the preceeding section appears to be underlying the selection of these activities. It may also be true that the caveat discussed in that section should be kept in mind when the reader examines the prioritization detailed in Tables B.1.c. and B.2.c. This is especially the case because of a discrepancy between the prioritizations of certain categories of Broad Educational Goals and Project Activities, which will be discussed in Chapter III.

---

[1] 1981-82 Annual Report, Washington State Johnson-O'Malley Education Programs for Indian Children. Olympia: Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction. p. 12.

[2] see Reyhner, Jon A. "The Self-determined Curriculum: Indian Teachers as Cultural Translators". Journal of American Indian Education. November, 1981, 21, 19-20.

CHAPTER III: CONSIDERATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

CONSIDERATIONS ARISING FROM THE STUDY

While Tables B.1 and B.2. speak plainly about the beliefs held by Indian parents and the school personnel who work with them to plan for the curricular needs of Indian children in the public schools of Washington State, they also tell of a lack of coherence between the Broad Educational Goals of the curriculum being supported by Johnson-O'Malley program and the translation of those Goals into actual Project Activities. Reader comparison of the prioritizations revealed in Tables B.2.b. and B.2.c. should be made before continuing.

It is clear that no discrepancy exists between the highest priority Goal and Activity; while it is possible to question the effectiveness of individualized and small-group tutorials as a means for attaining improved achievement in the basic skills,[1] there is at least a clear correspondence between Goal and Activity for this category.

This is not the case for the second highest Goal and the second highest Activity. The Goal category is improved participation in extracurricular activities; the category has no exact counterpart in Activities, but is supported there by several elements of other categories. It is true that a minor element of the second highest

Activity (Counseling Services) includes counseling intended to encourage activities participation, but the next concrete Activities listed in support of extracurricular participation are ranked in seventh, eighth, and ninth places, and include such practical assistance as meeting activities expenses for the indigent, providing awards and incentives, and arranging transport for the participants, who often live on a reservation at some distance from the school site. This situation presents a less clear correspondence between valuation of Goal and of Activity.

We now begin to find correspondence breaking down more completely, although not totally. For example, the third highest valued Activity (Indian culture activities/coursework in the school program) is ranked as the ninth highest Goal. The fourth highest Activity (home-school liason services) is the least valued Goal at seventeenth! Counseling services, which appears as the second most valued Activity, was ranked twelfth as a Goal. However, Activities intended to promote Indian parent involvement in the JOM PAC functions and in school activities (fifth and sixth ranked, respectively) find near correspondence in their comparable-category Goals, which are valued in sixth and fourth positions,

respectively.

This picture of matches and mismatches suggests a lack of coherence in the planning of the JOM projects in a goodly number of the districts and programs. Given the fact that two rather different groups of people must sit down together and develop the Project proposals, and that the Indian PACs are empowered to refuse their permission to any portion of a program which does not meet with their approbation, we are faced with what appears to be a paradox in this lack of coherence. The author will suggest the following hypothesis to account for this anomalous situation: when it comes time to translate Goals into concrete Activities, the professional school people are able to effectively lobby the Indian parents into approving those Activities which are of most importance in the estimation of the school personnel, despite the fact that many of these Activities are valued at a rather low level by the parents in their input into the Goals statement writing process. Lacking the self-perception of expertise which they impute to the school people, the Indian parents acquiesce in the judgements of the professionals rather than insist upon their own priorities. It is notable that the Activities which are ranked high while the corresponding Goals are ranked low

tend to be those which will involve the expenditure of funds on salaried positions rather than on the direct provision of services to the Indian students, although this may be arguable in the case of counseling services (until one realizes that most counseling is directed to persuading Indian students to "go along" with the program and values of the school which are not always the same as Indian values and programs might be if a situation of dominance did not exist, culturally, in the schools). It is instructive that the first four Activities, in order of valuation, are ones which involve the paying of salaries. This suggests that the Indian parents are not yet able to express a consistently unique Indian point of view about the priorities for the education of their children through the medium of the Johnson-O'Malley programs in the public schools of Washington. The impact on curricular practices in the most valued Goal areas other than improved academic achievement of Indian parent input appears to be limited due to the necessity of coming to a modus vivendi with the preferences of public schools personnel.

RECOMMENDATIONS

It would be desirable to verify (and, perhaps, to elaborate upon) the findings and hypotheses arising out of

the present study by conducting parallel studies of three other types of situations: a) the curricular impact of Indian parent participation in other Indian education programs in Washington State (Title IV, primarily); b) the curricular impact of Indian parents on practices in the public schools of other States; and, c) the nature of curricular practices in Indian-controlled schools with a predominantly Indian staff. One would basically seek to discern what Indian parents believe the unique educational needs of their children are, whether it is possible (or not) to generalize such findings into a model for Indian education (or, as Krebs and Stevens stated in their 1971 study of Indian educational needs [2], that a single, unified model is unlikely due to the diversity which exists among the cultures of Indian tribes nationally), and, when given the opportunity to take full responsibility for the education of their own children once more, whether Indian curricular practice would vary from present, conventional, public school norms, and if so, in what ways. The author believes that the combination of knowledge arising out of well-conducted studies of these kinds would produce answers to the question which has meant survival or disaster for Indians for several centuries: in paraphrase of Sitting Bull, now that we must walk the white man's

road, how shall we come to choose what is useful, leaving the rest, so that we may be powerful and yet still beautiful as Indians?

---

[1]A comparison of reading and mathematics standardized achievement testing results reported in the 1974 and 1981 Annual Reports of the Washington State JOM programs, although not conclusive due to differences in statistical techniques, suggests that while tutorial efforts may help improve achievement, they are not a total solution to the "problem" of Indian achievement below national norms. In 1974, when $323,951 was spent on tutorials, Indian students in Washington averaged 1.12 grade levels below norm in reading achievement and 0.91 grade levels below norm in math achievement. In 1981, with only $129,068 spent on tutorials, NCE (normal curve equivalents) measurements revealed reading achievement at 47.2 (50 being the national norm) and math achievement averaging 46.3. Apparently, some improvement was made in approaching nationally-normed levels of performance, despite a reduction in the funding of tutorial services by nearly two-thirds. When the effects of inflation on the quantity of service delivered for the dollar is considered, it is apparent that something other than the tutorials must be accounting for a major portion of the improvement. It would be worthwhile to find out what that "something" might be. See 1974 Annual Report, p. 18 and 24, and also 1981 Annual Report, p. 16 and 20.

[2]Krebs and Stevens, op. cit., Preface.

LIST OF REFERENCES

1974 and 1981 Annual Reports, Washington State Johnson-O'Malley Education Programs for Indian Children. Olympia: Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction.

Brouillet, Frank B. "A Declaration of Indian Education Policy by the State Superintendent of Public Instruction." October 7, 1975.

Jones, J.A. "Landmarks on the Path of Indian Education." Thresholds in Education. May, 1978, IV.

Krebs, Robert E. and Stevens, Gail A. An Assessment of Needs Related to the Education of Indian Children in the State of Washington. Toppenish: Center for the Study of Migrant and Indian Education. 1971.

Reyhner, Jon A. "The Self-determined Curriculum: Indian Teachers as Cultural Translators". Journal of American Indian Education. November, 1981, 21.

Subcommittee on Indian Education, Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Final Report. 91st Congress. 1st Session. November, 1969.

Szasz, Margaret C. Education and the American Indian. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press. 1977.

APPENDIX A: STATE FORM E-376

SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION
The Old Capitol Building
Olympia, Washington 98504

FORM S-376 (3/80)

SCHOOL DISTRICT _____ COUNTY _____

Telephone Number _____

Project Director _____

_____

Total JOM Request for 19____-____ $ _____

This application for financial assistance offer to contract is hereby accepted and approved for the amount of $ _____

_____ Date _____
Emmett S. Oliver, Supervisor of Indian Education, by and for the Superintendent of Public Instruction, State of Washington.

APPLICATION FOR FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FROM INDIAN EDUCATION FUND (JOM): SCHOOL YEAR 19____-____

CONTRACT ASSURANCES: This application has been developed and approved for eligible Indian students in this local educational agency by the Johnson-O'Malley Parent Education Committee and the LEA officials. The parties to the program agree that the program, if approved, will be carried out as shown in Columns A through D herein. The parties further agree to operate the program in compliance with applicable provisions of federal law and regulations including but not limited to those related to P.L. 93-638, Part #273, the Washington State Plan for Johnson-O'Malley, and the Indian Education Manual which are, by this reference, incorporated into and made a part of this agreement.

(Signed) _____ Date _____
SUPERINTENDENT OR OFFICIAL REPRESENTATIVE

(Signed) _____ Date _____
CHAIRPERSON, JOM COMMITTEE

For State Office Use Only

Prerequisites to program approval which are to be checked off in the approval process:

	Yes	No
Committee Constitution		
Job descriptions for all positions		
Evidence of satisfactory committee participation		
Has the district applied for Title I ESEA?		
Has the district applied for Title IV, Part A, P.L. 92-318?		

(See JOM Regulations: Sec. 273.34)

Distribution:

Fiscal (original)	
JOM Committee	
School District	
Bureau of Indian Affairs	
File Copy	

I. General Information

a. JOM Committee Names

Secretary: / Address:	Parents "Eligible Indian Children" Yes	No

b. JOM Program Staff Names:

	Indian Yes	No

c. If funds from sources other than JOM are used in program, please provide the following information:

1. Amount $ _____
2. Source $ _____
3. How used _____

_____

_____

II. Enrollment Information

*Eligible Indian children are those meeting the Code of Federal Regulations, Title 25, Chapter 1, Sec. 273.12 (P.L. 93-638).

COLUMN O
INDIAN COMMUNITY GOALS
(Prioritized and Roman Numeraled)

Estimated Enrollment for Program Application Year 19____-____

(Circle appropriate grades in each level.)

	District Total All Students	Eligible Indian Students*
a. Pre-Kindergarten		
b. Kindergarten Age 5		
c. Elementary School Level 1 2 3 4 5 6		
d. Middle School or Junior High Level 4 5 6 7 8 9		
e. High School Level 9 10 11 12		
f. Special Education (Ungraded)		
Total Enrollment		

II. Program Development

1. Column O should reflect desires of Indian community as expressed by committee. These goals need not be achieved in any specified time.
2. For Columns A, B, C, & D, committee suggests program plans and school administrator develops these columns in proper form.
3. In Column D, budget items must be justified by an activity or component in Column C.
4. Use horizontal lines to separate program components where practical.
5. Note that Columns A & B should be copied on Form F-188 during the time of program planning to implement evaluation.

← Developed by Both PEC and

COLUMN A BROAD EDUCATIONAL GOALS AS MAIN HEADINGS (In capital letters and related to community goals by Roman numeral) Annual measurable objectives as subheadings (Lower case letters and enumerated by letter)	COLUMN B EVALUATION PROCEDURES (To be related to objectives by letter)

School Administrators →

COLUMN C PROJECT ACTIVITIES OR COMPONENTS (Indicate all related educational objectives in parentheses) Program functions may be described more fully in job descriptions	No. of Students Served	Grade Level	COLUMN D BUDGET REQUIREMENT (Itemize activity and F-125 budget object)	Prelim. Estimate	Final Approval
			UNMET NEEDS OR SUMMER PROJECT		

APPENDIX B: TABLES

TABLE B.1.a.: COMMUNITY GOALS (PRIORITY 1 AND 2)

# - %age of Responses	PWV for Category	Category Content - Priority 1
10 - 33.3%	50	Economic/employment development
8 - 23.3%	40	Improved tribal relations with school, non-Indians
7 - 20.0%	35	Improved quality/relevancy of education
3 - 10.0%	15	Improved Indian self-image
2 - 6.6%	10	Improved tribal government

Program N=27; Response N=30 (1 program w/3, 1 w/2)

Priority 2

8 - 29.6%	32	Improved quality/relevance of education
6 - 22.2%	24	Improved tribal government
4 - 14.8%	16	Economic/employment development
4 - 14.8%	16	Improved tribal relations with school, non-Indians
3 - 11.1%	12	Improved Indian cultural environment/participation
2 - 7.4%	8	Improved Indian self-image

Program N=25; Response N=27 (2 programs w/2)

NOTE: All percentages presented are given to one significant figure to the right of the decimal on all Tables in Appendix B.

TABLE B.1.a. (Continued): COMMUNITY GOALS (PRIORITY 3 AND 4)

# - %age of Responses	PWV for Category	Category Content
		Priority 3
5 - 25.0%	15	Improved quality/relevance of education
4 - 20.0%	12	Improved Indian cultural environment/participation
4 - 20.0%	12	Improved tribal relations with school, non-Indians
3 - 15.0%	9	Improved tribal government
2 - 10.0%	6	Economic/employment development
2 - 10.0%	6	Improved Indian self-image

Program N=18; Response N=20 (2 programs w/2

		Priority 4
4 - 33.3%	8	Improved Indian cultural environment/participation
3 - 25.0%	6	Improved tribal relations with school, non-Indians
2 - 16.6%	4	Economic/employment development
2 - 16.6%	4	Improved tribal government
1 - 8.3%	2	Improved quality/relevance of education

Program N=9; Response N=12 (1 program w/3), 1 w/2

TABLE B.1.b.: BROAD EDUCATIONAL GOALS (PRIORITY 1 AND 2)

# - %age of Responses	PWV for Category	Category Content - Priority 1
18 - 43.9%	90	Improved achievement in one or more basic skills
6 - 14.6%	30	Improved retention/advancement/H.S. completion
4 - 9.7%	20	Improved attendance
4 - 9.7%	20	Increased extracurricular activities participation
3 - 7.3%	15	Improved achievement in total school program
3 - 7.3%	15	Improved relevance of education to Indian needs
1 - 2.4%	5	School personnel participation in Indian culture
1 - 2.4%	5	Improved transport to school, activities
1 - 2.4%	5	Improved resource center skills and usage

Program N=27; Response N=30 (1 program w/3, 1 w/2)

Priority 2

7 - 18.9%	28	Increased extracurricular activities participation
7 - 18.9%	28	Improved JOM parent participation in school activity
5 - 13.5%	20	Improved retention/advancement/H.S. completion
5 - 13.5%	20	Improved parent participation in JOM PAC functions
3 - 8.1%	12	Improved attendance
3 - 8.1%	12	Improved achievement in one or more basic skills
2 - 5.4%	8	Indian culture activities/courses in school
2 - 5.4%	8	Improved careers/vocational awareness
1 - 2.7%	4	Improved achievement in total school program

TABLE B.1.b. (CONTINUED): BROAD EDUCATIONAL GOALS (PRIORITY 2, CONT. AND 3)

# - %age of Responses	PWV for Category	Category Content - Priority 2 (continued)
1 - 2.7%	4	Improved student participation in Indian culture
1 - 2.7%	4	Improved guidance/support systems in school

Program N=30; Response N=37 (8 programs w/2)

Priority 3

6 - 21.4%	18	Improved student participation in Indian culture
5 - 17.8%	15	Improved JOM parent participation in school activity
3 - 10.7%	9	Improved achievement in one or more basic skills
3 - 10.7%	9	Improved attendance
3 - 10.7%	9	Increased extracurricular activities participation
2 - 7.1%	6	Improved retention/advancement/H.S. completion
2 - 7.1%	6	Improved parent participation in JOM PAC functions
2 - 7.1%	6	Maximum educational opportunity for all
1 - 3.5%	3	Indian culture activities/courses in school
1 - 3.5%	3	Improved guidance/support systems in school

Program N=19; Response N=28 (1 program w/3), 7 w/2

TABLE B.1.b. (CONTINUED): BROAD EDUCATIONAL GOALS (PRIORITY 4 AND 5)

# - %age of Responses	PWV for Category	Category Content - Priority 4
3 - 25.0%	6	Improved parent participation in JOM PAC functions
2 - 16.6%	4	Improved JOM parent participation in school activity
2 - 16.6%	4	Student awards/incentives programs
2 - 16.6%	4	Improved relevance of education to Indian needs
1 - 8.3%	2	Improved achieveement in one or more basic skills
1 - 8.3%	2	School personnel participation in Indian culture
1 - 8.3%	2	Improved home-school liason

Program N=9; Response N=12 (3 programs w/2)

Priority 5

1 - 33.3%	1	Improved JOM parent participation in school activity
1 - 33.3%	1	Improved parent participation in JOM PAC functions
1 - 33.3%	1	Improved student participation in Indian culture
3 - 10.7%	9	Improved attendance

Program N=2; Response N=3 (1 program w/2)

TABLE B.1.c.: PROJECT ACTIVITIES (PRIORITY 1 AND 2)

# - %age of Responses	PWV for Category	Category Content - Priority 1
20 - 37.7%	100	Tutorials in one or more basic skills
13 - 24.5%	65	Counseling (academic/attendance/personal/activities
6 - 11.3%	30	Home-school liason services
3 - 5.6%	15	PAC hardship fund (class/activities expenses
3 - 5.6%	15	Indian culture activities/courses in school
2 - 3.7%	10	Transport to school, activities
2 - 3.7%	10	Operation of a resource media center
1 - 1.8%	5	Operation of a student store for economic education
1 - 1.8%	5	JOM personnel training
1 - 1.8%	5	Student awards/incentives program
1 - 1.8%	5	Operation of a preschool program

Program N=30; (1 specified no activity); Response N=53 (1 w/4, 4 w/3, 11 w/2)

Priority 2

10 - 21.2%	40	Counseling (academic/attendance/personal/activities
7 - 14.8%	28	Home-school liason services
7 - 14.8%	28	PAC involvement incentives, parent-school socials
5 - 10.6%	20	PAC functions required/permitted by law
5 - 10.6%	20	Indian culture activities/courses in school
3 - 6.3%	12	Tutorials in one or more basic skills
3 - 6.3%	12	Student awards/incentives program

TABLE B.1.c. (CONTINUED): PROJECT ACTIVITIES (PRIORITY 2, CONT. AND 3)

# - %age of Responses	PWV for Category	Category Content - Priority 2 (continued)
2 - 4.2%	8	PAC hardship fund (class/activities expenses
2 - 4.2%	8	Operation of a pre-school program
2 - 4.2%	8	JOM personnel training
1 - 2.1%	4	Nationally-normed achievement testing

Program N=28; (2 specified no activity); Response N=47 (1 w/5, 3 w/3, 9 w/2)

Priority 3

9 - 27.2%	27	Indian culture activities/courses in school
5 - 15.1%	15	Counseling (academic/attendance/personal/activities
4 - 12.1%	12	PAC functions required/permitted by law
3 - 9.0%	9	Tutorials in one or more basic skills
3 - 9.0%	9	Transport to school, activities
3 - 9.0%	9	PAC involvement incentives, parent-school socials
2 - 6.0%	6	PAC hardship fund (class/activities expenses)
2 - 6.0%	6	JOM personnel training
1 - 3.0%	3	Student awards/incentives program
1 - 3.0%	3	Operation of a pre-school program

Program N=21; (2 specified no activity); Response N=33 (4 w/3, 4 w/2)

TABLE B.1.c. (CONTINUED): PROJECT ACTIVITIES (PRIORITY 4 AND 5)

# - %age of Responses	PW* for Category	Category Content - Priority 4
3 - 21.4%	6	PAC functions required/permitted by law
2 - 14.2%	4	JOM administrative costs allowed by law
2 - 14.2%	4	Student awards/incentives programs
1 - 7.1%	2	Tutorials in one or more basic skills
1 - 7.1%	2	Counseling (academic/attendance/personal/activities
1 - 7.1%	2	Home-school liason services
1 - 7.1%	2	PAC involvement incentives, parent-school socials
1 - 7.1%	2	PAC hardship fund (class/activities expenses)
1 - 7.1%	2	Indian culture activities/courses in school
1 - 7.1%	2	Nationally-normed achievement testing

Program N=9; Response N=14 (1 program w/3, 3 w?2)

Priority 5

2 - 66.6%	2	PAC functions required/permitted by law
1 - 33.3%	1	Indian culture activities/courses in school

Program N=2; Response N=3 (1 program w/2)

TABLE B.2.: PRIORITY WEIGHTED VALUATION STATEWIDE TOTALS
(ORDINAL RELATIONSHIPS AMONG COMMUNITY GOALS, BROAD EDUCATIONAL GOALS AND PROJECT ACTIVITIES AS DETERMINED BY INDIAN PARENT ADVISORY COMMITTEES IN THE JOHNSON-O'MALLEY PROGRAMS OF WASHINGTON STATE DURING P.Y. 1980-1981)

a.: COMMUNITY GOALS

PWV Total		Category Content
84		Improved quality/relevance of education
76		Economic/employment development
74		Improved tribal relations with school, non-Indians
47		Improved tribal government
32		Improved Indian cultural environment/participation
29		Improved Indian self-image

b.: BROAD EDUCATIONAL GOALS

113	>comparable<	Improved achievement in one or more basic skills
29	(132 sum)	Improved achievement in total school academic program
57		Increased extracurricular activities participation
56		Improved retention/advancement/High School completion
48		Improved JOM parent participation in school activities
41		Improved attendance
33		Improved parent participation in JOM PAC functions
23		Improved student participation in Indian culture
19		Improved relevance of education to Indian needs/values
11		Indian culture activities/courses in school

TABLE B.2. (CONTINUED): PRIORITY WEIGHTED VALUATION STATEWIDE TOTALS

a.: BROAD EDUCATIONAL GOALS (Continued)

PWV Total	Category Content
8	Improved careers/vocational awareness
7	School personnel participation in Indian culture activities
7	Improved guidance/support services in the schools
6	LMaximization of educational opportunities for all
5	Improved transport to school, activities
5	Improved resource center skills and usage by students
4	Student awards/incentives programs
2	Improved home-school liason services

c.: PROJECT ACTIVITIES

123	Tutorials in one or more basic skills (reading, math, Lang. Arts)
122	Counseling services (achievement/attendance/personal/ activities)
65	Indian culture activities/courses in the schools
60	Home-school liason (parent counseling re: progress, programs)
40	PAC functions required/permitted by law
39	PAC involvement incentives, parent-school staff socials
29	PAC hardship funds (class/activities expenses support)
20	Student awards (JOM annual)/incentives programs

TABLE B.2. (CONTINUED): PRIORITY WEIGHTED VALUATION STATEWIDE TOTALS

19	Transport to/from school, activities
19	JOM school personnel training
16	Operation of pre-school programs
10	Operation of resource media center
6	Nationallly-normed achievement testing administration
5	Operation of student store for economics education
4	Funding of JOM administrative costs allowed to schools by law

Executive Summary of the Study

Purpose: The study attempts to derive measures of the influence of Indian Parent Advisory Committees (PACs) over school curricula and activities supported by Johnson-O'Malley Act funds in the State of Washington.

Methods: The study relies upon data abstracted from Washington State form E-376 (Application For Financial Assistance From Johnson-O'Malley Indian Education Fund) for the 1980-81 school year. Applications for 31 educational programs were surveyed for information relating to Indian Community Goals, Broad Educational Goals and specific Program Activities intended to meet or support the Goals. A measure of the significance of each goal or activity, called the Priority Weighted Valuation, was developed by taking the product of reported priority of a goal or activity multiplied by the frequency of appearance of such goal or activity in the applications. Finally, these PWVs were summed for each goal or activity to provide ordinal measures of the "importance" of each, with comparisons made between PAC expressions of curricular concerns and actual school program attempts to meet those concerns.

Findings: The study finds some seventeen Broad Educational Goals expressed by PACs, while Program Activities fall into some fifteen categories of services. Due to the complex and

sometimes overlapping character of the goals and activities found, one-to-one correlation figures are not presented; tables are used to demonstrate the relationships between goals and activities. PWV rankings which display close correspondence (from zero to three places of difference in the ranking tables) are found for seven goal-activity pairs, including: improved academic achievement, improved retention/advancement/completion of Indian students in school programs, improved parent participation in school-related activities, improved attendance, increased parent involvement in PAC activities, improved relevance of education to Indian needs and values, and improved student skills and usage of resource centers. Lesser degrees of correspondence (from four to eight places of difference in the ranking tables) are found for five goal-activity pairs, including: increased student participation in extra-curricular activities, Indian culture courses or activities in the schools, improved student awareness of careers/vocations' improved transport systems, and student awards/incentives programs. Very low correspondence (more than eight places of difference in the ranking tables) are found for two goal-activity pairs: counseling services and home-school liaison. Three goals (improved Indian student participation in Indian culture, school personnel participation in Indian cultural activities, and maximized educational opportunity for all) do not have corresponding activities, while two activities

(administration of nationally-normed tests and funding of school costs of JOM program administration) do not have corresponding goals.

The predominant goal of Indian parents appears well-matched by school activity; improved academic achievement is the major concern of both parents and schools. However, the correspondence between goals and activities seems to break down in many of the subsequent goal-activity matchings. For example, the second-highest ranked activity (counseling services) addresses several goals in part with fairly good correspondence in the rankings, yet is valued much lower by parents than by schools when improved counseling services are considered as a goal. Schools also rate home-school liaison activities highly (fourth place in the rankings) compared to parents (seventeenth). Only some 41% of goals and corresponding activities have rankings within three places of each other when measured by Priority Weighted Valuation. This fact suggests that PAC influence over the actually-delivered services of school-run JOM programs is not yet predominant or even equal when compared with that of school administrations or staffs.

Considerations: The study hypothesizes an influence of professional opinion on PAC approvals of Program Activities which may account for many of the discrepancies between those

activities and the Broad Educational Goals which (in theory) are the justification for the Activities.

The study does not attempt to measure the effectiveness of the Program Activities in meeting either Community Goals or Broad Educational Goals. These concerns, in part, are responded to in the Annual Reports on JOM prepared by the Office of the Supervisor of Indian Education in OSPI. Persons concerned with this aspect of Indian education in Washington State are advised to consult the appropriate Annual Report.

Since the data upon which this study is based were collected, reductions in JOM funding to Washington State have severely reduced the scope of Program Activities which are financially feasible. Thus, observations of current JOM Goals and Activities should take into account that high-priority goals or activities may be reduced or absent if these involve large expenditures. Nevertheless, the study may possess worth as an indicator of Indian parents' educational values in the recent, less-constrained past.

TABLE C: COMPARISON OF RANKINGS OF PRIORITY WEIGHTED VALUATIONS OF BROAD EDUCATIONAL GOALS AND PROGRAM ACTIVITIES (BASED UPON PWV STATEWIDE TOTALS, TABLES B.2.b. and B.2.c.)

GOAL TITLE	GOAL RANK	ACTIVITY RANK	ACTIVITY TITLE
Improved academic achievement	1	1	Academic tutorials
Increased extracurricular activity participation	2	8*	Hardship fund, awards, transport
Improved retention/advancement completion	3	2'	Counseling services
Improved parent involvement in school activities	4	5*	Home-school liaison, PAC involvement incentives
Improved attendance	5	2'	Counseling services
Increased parent PAC involvement	6	6	PAC involvement incentives
Improved student participation in Indian culture	7	-	No comparable item
Improved relevance of education to Indian needs/values	8	6*	PAC functions, PAC involvement incentives, PAC hardship fund
Indian cultural courses/ activities in school	9	3	Indian cultural courses/activities in school
Improved careers/vocational awareness	10	14	Student store operation
School personnel participation in Indian culture	11	-	No comparable item
Improved guidance services	12	2'	Counseling services
Maximized educational opportur ties for all	13	-	No comparable item
Improved transportation	14	9	Transportation services
Improved resource center skill	15	12	Operation of resource center
Student awards/incentives	16	8	JOM and other awards
Improved home/school liaison	17	4	Home/school liaison
No comparable item	-	13	National-normed achievement tests
No comparable item	-	15	School administrative costs

* Average of rankings of 2 or more relevant Activities
' A portion of the Activity addressed to associated Goal

SPI

DR. FRANK B. BROUILLET

Superintendent of Public Instruction

Old Capitol Building, FG-11, Olympia, WA 98504

IPS/642/84